1	LAW EDEL CON (PRO MAGNICE)	
	JAY EDELSON (<i>PRO HAC VICE</i>) MYLES MCGUIRE (<i>PRO HAC VICE</i>)	
2	KAMBEREDELSON, LLC 53 West Jackson Boulevard	
3	Suite 1530 Chicago, Illinois 60604	
4	Telephone: (312) 589-6370	
5 6	JOHN G. JACOBS (<i>PRO HAC VICE</i>) BRYAN G. KOLTON (<i>PRO HAC VICE</i>) THE JACOBS LAW FIRM, CHTD.	
7	122 South Michigan Avenue Suite 1850	
8	Chicago, Illinois 60603 Telephone: (312) 427-4000	
9	Facsimile: (312) 427-1850	
10	TERRY M. GORDON - SBN 75604 LAW OFFICES OF TERRY M. GORDON	
11	Three Harbor Drive, Suite 215 Sausalito, California 94965 Talankara (415) 221 2601	
12	Telephone: (415) 331-3601 Facsimile: (415) 331-1225	
13	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF	
14		
15	UNITED DISTRICT COURT	
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
17		
18	RUSSELL BRADBERRY, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situated) Case No. C 07 5298 CW
19	individuals,) PLAINTIFF'S WITHDRAWAL
20	Plaintiff,) OF MOTION TO REMAND)
21	v.	 Hearing Date: December 13, 2007 Time: 9:00 a.m. Dept.: Courtroom 2, 4th Floor
22	MBLOX, INC., a Delaware corporation,)
23	Defendant.) The Honorable Claudia Wilken
24) <u>CLASS ACTION</u>
25		
26		
27		
28		
	PLAINTIFF'S WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO REMAND	

Case No. C-07-5298 CW

1 In its opposition to Plaintiff's motion to remand, mBlox, Inc. presented evidence 2 establishing that the Court does have jurisdiction. This evidence was available to mBlox 3 when it removed, and should have been presented in its remand petition. Had mBlox done so, Plaintiff would have been saved the expense of this motion. Even now, the proper procedure 4 for mBlox to have followed was a motion to amend its petition¹, rather than in opposition to 5 this motion. Nevertheless, because mBlox has shown that a proper removal petition would 6 7 have established the Court's jurisdiction, Plaintiff hereby withdraws his motion to remand. 8 9 Dated: December 3, 2007 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICES OF TERRY M. GORDON

By:/s/ Terry M. Gordon

TERRY M. GORDON One of the Attorneys for RUSSELL BRADBERRY, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals

28

¹ See, eg. Gafford v. General Elec. Co. (6th Cir. 1993) 997 F. 2d 150, 164.